

University of Nebraska - Lincoln

DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln

POD Network Conference Materials

Professional and Organizational Development
Network in Higher Education

1996

POD Network, Scale the Heights, 1996, "Blind Review" Proposal Forms

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/podconference>



Part of the [Higher Education Administration Commons](#)

"POD Network, Scale the Heights, 1996, "Blind Review" Proposal Forms" (1996). *POD Network Conference Materials*. 198.

<https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/podconference/198>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Professional and Organizational Development Network in Higher Education at DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln. It has been accepted for inclusion in POD Network Conference Materials by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln.

POD Network

Scale the Heights 1996

Dear Reviewer:

In this packet you should receive the following things:

1. A cover letter telling you the dates that the reviews need to be returned, and the proposal conference numbers.
2. A copy of the conference theme and track criteria which the proposal writers used to prepare their proposal.
3. Nine (9) proposals to read and review. Please take note of each proposal number so that we can properly file and keep track of them.
4. A proposal summary form for each proposal. Please make all your notes and recommendations on the summary.
5. A return envelope with Ed Jensen's address. **Only put the proposal summary forms in the envelope and return by APRIL 26!!!**

"BLIND REVIEW" PROPOSAL FORM

(Indicate no names and no institutions. Send five [5] copies of this form stapled to five [5] copies of a one-page typewritten summary of proposal.)

102
accept

**21st Annual POD Conference
October 17-20, 1996**

SCALING THE HEIGHTS

1. **Session title** Critically Reflecting on Our Problem Setting/Solving Strategies

2. **Track** (Select one only) ☐ Traditional
☒ Organizational Development
☐ Instructional Technology

3. **Type of Session:** *Due to the large number of excellent proposals submitted each year and to the constraints of site logistics, it is sometimes impossible to accommodate your first choice of session type. If you want your proposal to be considered for another type of session, please indicate here: 1=1st choice; 2=2nd choice, etc. If you do NOT want your proposal considered for any but your first choice, indicate "1st" and leave the others boxes blank.*

Preconference Workshop ☐ 3 hrs
or
☐ 6 hrs

Concurrent Session ☒ 60 min
or
☐ 90 min

Breakfast Roundtable Discussion ☐

Poster session ☐

If no other time is available, would you be willing to schedule your concurrent session DURING an educational/recreational excursion (anticipating potentially lower attendance)?

☐ Yes ☒ No

3. **Abstract** of no more than 50 words which will appear in the printed program if the proposal is accepted:

As members of organizations we always act to solve problems as we see them. In this session we will use a case to examine the impact of different perspectives on the way one sets the problem(s) to be solved and the strategies one employs to solve them. The theoretical perspectives used will be based on the work of Argyris and Schon, and Bolman and Deal.

4. Describe briefly the methodology of the proposed session:

After a brief introduction to the session, participants will be asked on their own to read a short case and to identify what they think the problem is and what they would do. We will then present the Bolman and Deal frameworks. In small groups, participants will discuss how the case could be interpreted in terms of each of the frameworks, and how this analysis compares with their own. In the large group we will explore the implications of these different perspectives on how we approach faculty/instructional development problems within the context of our own organizations.

5. Equipment needed:

☐ none

☒ overhead transparency projector (and screen)

☐ 1/2" VHS player and monitor

☒ flipchart, pens, easel

☐ audio cassette recorder/player

☐ carousel slide projector and screen

**For "exotic" equipment and set-ups, contact the Program Chair:
jensene@byuh.edu BEFORE submitting your proposal.**

6. Type a **1-page summary** of your proposal detailing the objectives of the session you propose and how you intend to meet those objectives. (The summaries will undergo a "blind evaluation" process; hence, no identifying names or institutions should be in evidence.) Make five (5) copies of the summary and staple them to the five (5) copies of this form. Include one (1) copy of the cover sheet and send to the appropriate person listed below:

All proposals must be postmarked by Friday, March 8, 1996

Mail Concurrent, Roundtable &
Poster Session Proposals to:

Ed Jensen
Brigham Young University-Hawaii
124C JS Library, Box 1841
Laie HI 96762
Phone: 808-293-3853
Fax: 808-293-3877
E: jensene@byuh.edu

*Please note time
zone difference; this
is a Hawaii number!*

Mail Pre-Conference Workshop
Proposals to:

Arletta Knight
University of Oklahoma
Carnegie 115
Norman OK 73019
Phone: 405-325-3521
Fax: 405-325-7383
E: aknight@uoknor.edu

(Proposals must be mailed; phone, fax & email information is provided for inquiry purposes only.)

**Thank you for your interest in contributing to the tradition
of quality that is characteristic of POD Conferences.**

Critically Reflecting on Our Problem Setting/Solving Strategies

As faculty/instructional developers we may have different positions in the organization and play different roles. No matter what our position or role is in the organization, we all confront problematic situation. Our best efforts to improve the organization (to design, develop and implement programs, to change policy, to persuade resistant or reluctant colleagues, etc.) are all based our own assessment of what the "problem" is which has to be solved. In this session we will explore the impact of different perspectives on how one sets and tries to solve problems.

The work of Argyris and Schon¹ describe how professionals act when confronted with a problematic situation, one where they are not achieving their intentions. They first frame or name the problem to be solved, then act to solve the problem they have set for themselves. They listen to the "talk back" from their actions to determine if the problem is solved. If not, they try new strategies, or change the name of the problem to be solved. Schon calls this process of frames, actions, consequences "reflection-in-action." In this session we want to examine a case to discover how the problem is framed and to identify which actions follow from how the problem is set.

Many authors have offered different ways of thinking about organizations. Bergquist² has talked about different cultures. Morgan³ has provided 8 different images of organizations. In this session we want to introduce and use the work of Bolman and Deal⁴. They provide four different lenses, or frameworks, for thinking about organizations, structural, human resource, political, and cultural or symbolic. In this session we will ask participants to respond to a case study from within one of the frameworks and suggest strategies for action.

The session will conclude with a discussion of the implications of different perspectives on problem setting and problem solving. We will offer resources for further exploration and study.

¹ Argyris, C., & Schon, D. (1974). Theory in Practice: Increasing Professional Effectiveness. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Argyris, C., & Schon, D. (1978). Organizational Learning: A Theory of Action Perspective. Reading MA: Addison-Wesley.

Schon, D. (1983). The Reflective Practitioner: How Professionals Think in Action. New York, NY: Basic Books.

² Bergquist, W., (1992) The Four Cultures of the Academy: Insights and Strategies for Improving Leadership in Collegiate Organizations. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

³ Morgan, G. (1986). Images of Organization. Beverley Hills: Sage Publications.

⁴ Bolman, L. & Deal, T. (1984). Modern Approaches to Understanding and Managing Organizations. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

1996 CONFERENCE THEME:

SCALING THE HEIGHTS

Building on the 1995 POD conference theme, "Charting a Course for Teaching and Learning," the 1996 conference offers the opportunity to use those charts in "scaling the heights" at the annual meeting, this year set in the Rocky Mountains near Salt Lake City, Utah at Snowbird Resort and Conference Center.

The 1996 POD conference allows maximum possibilities for growth in three areas of focus:

- 1) "Traditional" faculty development (issues in teaching and learning, programs, research and practice);
- 2) Organizational development (the "OD" in POD); and
- 3) Instructional Technology (Snowbird is teeming with media possibilities!).

In "scaling the heights," we invite vistas and visions of what can be; demonstrations of practice that are pinnacles of success; discussions of climbing attempts over seemingly insurmountable obstacles; and other proposals which traverse the mountains and valleys of our experience.

THE CONFERENCE TRACKS

Track 1: "Traditional" faculty development. By this we mean those kinds of sessions which have traditionally been the heart of POD conferences. These proposals reflect the best in research and practice for faculty and TA developers. Sessions are sought which feature innovative programs bringing new light to important issues in teaching and learning. Proposers are reminded that POD conferences draws out those who are new to the field, as well as veterans with decades of experience. No session can be "all things to all people;" keep your session focused.

Track II: Organizational development. "Back by popular demand" — the "OD" in POD! Administrators are invited, as are faculty and developers, to address "larger issues:" how institutions can support a culture that values teaching and learning, how to engage a larger constituency, and so forth. These sessions may be directed to administrators, to developers, or to both. Proposals should reflect the desired audience.

Track III: Instructional technology. First, a few words about what this track is NOT. It is not a rehash of AECT or EduCom or other conferences where the newest electronic "bells and whistles" are trotted out to the hushed whispers of "Wowww!" It is an occasion to make use of the best technology facilities we've encountered. It is an opportunity to demonstrate how principles of good course design, good practice in creating student learning environments, and understanding of technology's potential come together. Proposals which show technology applications in the instructional process are encouraged. Internet usage, multi-media development, mediated classroom usage, distance learning projects are of interest. We are mindful that constrained budgets often fund only one conference (and we're glad it's POD!); consequently some PODders have little opportunity to see the potential of instructional technology for enhancing student learning. Oftentimes these same PODders are expected to be "in the know" and serve as resources on their campuses—hence this "track" in instructional technology.

FORMAT OPTIONS FOR CONFERENCE SESSIONS

Preconference Workshops:

either 3-hr
or
6-hr skill-building sessions

Concurrent Sessions:

either 60-min **or** 90-min interactive
sessions skillfully designed for
professionals

Breakfast Roundtable Discussions:

less structured mini-presentations
with abundant, informal discussion

***Poster Sessions:**

“show and tell” opportunities to
present *exemplary* programs, practice or
relevant research

**Please note that conference registration materials
will also provide an opportunity to request space at
the Materials and Resource Fair.*

CRITERIA FOR PROPOSAL SELECTION

The program and pre-conference workshop committees take seriously their charge from the Core Committee (board of directors) to select the most important, valuable and relevant proposals for presentation at the highly successful annual POD conferences. Presentations are expected to model exemplary teaching/learning methods. While single-presenter session proposals are accepted, collaborated sessions are encouraged as consistent with the POD network emphasis. (Consider collaborating with a colleague to design your session, if not actually to “team teach” it.)

The 1996 proposals will be evaluated on the basis of the following criteria:

- Relevance to the POD conference audience
- Likelihood of stimulating participant interaction
- Likelihood of offering/generating new data, ideas or insights
- Likelihood of providing usable information or skills
- Likelihood of resulting in generalizable, transferable outcomes

Each proposal will be reviewed for completeness and then assigned to two or more conference committee reviewers for “blind review.” The above criteria will be used to determine program inclusion. The program chair is responsible for making the final selection of conference sessions, based on the judgment of proposal reviewers and the blend of sessions at the conference. Each organizer will be notified of the outcome of the review process and will receive reviewer feedback on the proposal.

Past conference experience and evaluation has supported the principle that individuals submit not more than one proposal (as a principal organizer) for a pre-conference workshop and one proposal for a concurrent program session. It is encouraged that no one person serve as even a collaborating presenter in more than a total of three sessions (of all types) at the conference.

Last year’s evaluations reflected disappointment when sessions did not match descriptions in the proposals/program. Please be sure to accurately describe the intent and process of your session so that participants can make informed choices at conference time.

"BLIND REVIEW" PROPOSAL FORM

(Indicate no names and no institutions. Send five [5] copies of this form stapled to five [5] copies of a one-page typewritten summary of proposal.)

21st Annual POD Conference
October 17-20, 1996

SCALING THE HEIGHTS

1. **Session title** "Meeting the Professional Development Needs of Distance Educators"

2. **Track** (Select one only) ☒ Traditional
☐ Organizational Development
☐ Instructional Technology

3. **Type of Session:** Due to the large number of excellent proposals submitted each year and to the constraints of site logistics, it is sometimes impossible to accommodate your first choice of session type. If you want your proposal to be considered for another type of session, please indicate here: 1=1st choice; 2=2nd choice, etc. If you do NOT want your proposal considered for any but your first choice, indicate "1st" and leave the others boxes blank.

Preconference Workshop ☐ 3 hrs
or
☐ 6 hrs

Concurrent Session ☐ 60 min
or
☒ 90 min

Breakfast Roundtable Discussion ☐

Poster session ☐

If no other time is available, would you be willing to schedule your concurrent session DURING an educational/recreational excursion (anticipating potentially lower attendance)?

☒ Yes ☐ No

3. **Abstract** of no more than 50 words which will appear in the printed program if the proposal is accepted:

As colleges and universities become increasingly involved in distance education, faculty developers will have to respond to the professional needs of faculty who teach at-a-distance. This workshop will investigate the technological and pedagogical challenges faced by distance educators and suggest ways faculty developers can address these challenges.

4. **Describe briefly the methodology of the proposed session:**

Participants will engage in small group exercises that elicit thoughtful reflection about the challenges faced by distance educators and will share ideas on how faculty development can best be accomplished in a variety of institutional settings, ~~so that distance educators among the faculty can be served well.~~ Handouts on specific programs initiated at ~~_____~~ will provide opportunities for critique and discussion.

5. **Equipment needed:**

- ☐ none
- ☒ overhead transparency projector (and screen)
- ☐ 1/2" VHS player and monitor
- ☒ flipchart, pens, easel
- ☐ audio cassette recorder/player
- ☐ carousel slide projector and screen

**For "exotic" equipment and set-ups, contact the Program Chair:
jensene@byuh.edu BEFORE submitting your proposal.**

6. Type a **1-page summary** of your proposal detailing the objectives of the session you propose and how you intend to meet those objectives. (The summaries will undergo a "blind evaluation" process; hence, no identifying names or institutions should be in evidence.) Make five (5) copies of the summary and staple them to the five (5) copies of this form. Include one (1) copy of the cover sheet and send to the appropriate person listed below:

All proposals must be postmarked by Friday, March 8, 1996

Mail Concurrent, Roundtable &
Poster Session Proposals to:



Ed Jensen
Brigham Young University-Hawaii
124C JS Library, Box 1841
Laie HI 96762
Phone: 808-293-3853
Fax: 808-293-3877
E: jensene@byuh.edu

*Please note time
zone difference; this
is a Hawaii number!*

Mail Pre-Conference Workshop
Proposals to:



Arletta Knight
University of Oklahoma
Carnegie 115
Norman OK 73019
Phone: 405-325-3521
Fax: 405-325-7383
E: aknight@uoknor.edu

(Proposals must be mailed; phone, fax & email information is provided for inquiry purposes only.)

**Thank you for your interest in contributing to the tradition
of quality that is characteristic of POD Conferences.**

TITLE: "Meeting the Professional Development Needs of Distance Educators"

OBJECTIVES:

Participants at this workshop will:

- identify technological and pedagogical needs of distance educators;
- discuss the role of the faculty developer in helping distance educators meet these needs;
- evaluate specific faculty development initiatives to serve distance educators that could be implemented in a variety of institutional settings.

These objectives will be achieved via focused presentation, small group exercises, and whole group discussion.

FORMAT:

Beginning with a short overview of the expansion of distance education and the implications of this trend for both faculty technological literacy and pedagogy, participants will meet in small groups to discuss the question: "What is the role of the faculty developer in helping faculty meet these new challenges?"

As a whole group, we will generate a list of issues and concerns regarding (1) standards for technological literacy and technology training and (2) appropriate pedagogical responses to independent, student-centered learning and the shift from "instructor" to "facilitator."

Using the ideas generated and handouts describing initiatives now being implemented at [the presenter's home institution] to assist distance educators, participants will suggest formats for creating viable faculty development programs to address needs of distance educators in their own institutions.

"BLIND REVIEW" PROPOSAL FORM

(Indicate no names and no institutions. Send five [5] copies of this form stapled to five [5] copies of a one-page typewritten summary of proposal.)

21st Annual POD Conference
October 17-20, 1996

SCALING THE HEIGHTS

1. **Session title** Dialogue: Increasing Critical Reflection

2. **Track** (Select one only) ☒ Traditional
☐ Organizational Development
☐ Instructional Technology

3. **Type of Session:** *Due to the large number of excellent proposals submitted each year and to the constraints of site logistics, it is sometimes impossible to accommodate your first choice of session type. If you want your proposal to be considered for another type of session, please indicate here: 1=1st choice; 2=2nd choice, etc. If you do NOT want your proposal considered for any but your first choice, indicate "1st" and leave the others boxes blank.*

Preconference Workshop ☐ 3 hrs
or
☐ 6 hrs

Concurrent Session^x ☐ 60 min
or
1 90 minute
2 60 minute ☐ 90 min

Breakfast Roundtable Discussion ☐

Poster session ☐

If no other time is available, would you be willing to schedule your concurrent session DURING an educational/recreational excursion (anticipating potentially lower attendance)?

☒ Yes ☐ No

3. **Abstract** of no more than 50 words which will appear in the printed program if the proposal is accepted:

Reflective Practice and Critical Reflection are concepts that hold great promise for faculty development. At the heart of both of these concepts is the importance of identifying the assumptions that drive practice. This session will present an experiment in creating a faculty dialogue project. The structure of the program, topics pursued and the results of a qualitative study of teacher assumptions will be presented. Participants will experience a mock dialogue session.

4. **Describe briefly the methodology of the proposed session:**

1. Interactive group exercise to identify participants assumptions. 15 minutes
2. Didactic presentation of structure of program and the concept of dialogue. 30 minutes
3. Discussion of study results. 15 minutes
4. Engage in mock dialogue session. 30 minutes

5. **Equipment needed:**

- ☐ none
- ☐ overhead transparency projector (and screen)
- ☐ 1/2" VHS player and monitor
- ☒ flipchart, pens, easel
- ☐ audio cassette recorder/player
- ☒ carousel slide projector and screen

**For "exotic" equipment and set-ups, contact the Program Chair:
jensene@byuh.edu BEFORE submitting your proposal.**

6. Type a **1-page summary** of your proposal detailing the objectives of the session you propose and how you intend to meet those objectives. (The summaries will undergo a "blind evaluation" process; hence, no identifying names or institutions should be in evidence.) Make five (5) copies of the summary and staple them to the five (5) copies of this form. Include one (1) copy of the cover sheet and send to the appropriate person listed below:

All proposals must be postmarked by Friday, March 8, 1996

Mail Concurrent, Roundtable &
Poster Session Proposals to:



Ed Jensen
Brigham Young University-Hawaii
124C JS Library, Box 1841
Laie HI 96762
Phone: 808-293-3853
Fax: 808-293-3877
E: jensene@byuh.edu

*Please note time
zone difference; this
is a Hawaii number!*

Mail Pre-Conference Workshop
Proposals to:



Arletta Knight
University of Oklahoma
Carnegie 115
Norman OK 73019
Phone: 405-325-3521
Fax: 405-325-7383
E: aknight@uoknor.edu

(Proposals must be mailed; phone, fax & email information is provided for inquiry purposes only.)

**Thank you for your interest in contributing to the tradition
of quality that is characteristic of POD Conferences.**

6. As the discussions about faculty roles continue to raise possibilities of entirely new paradigms of instruction and a different identity, new methods of faculty development must be devised that will match these paradigms while preserving the crucial element of professional autonomy. This session will introduce an experiment to provide such a forum for faculty development - Dialogue.

Session Goals:

1. Participants will begin to examine their own assumptions about teaching.

This objective will be met through an interactive opening critical thinking exercise exploring assumptions in six areas: role of teacher, learning interactions, curriculum, institutional culture and role of higher education.

2. Participants will be introduced to the concept of dialogue and the structure of a faculty dialogue project to identify teacher assumptions.

This objective will be met through a didactic slide presentation outlining the structure of the program and the results of a qualitative study.

3. Participants will begin to engage in reflective practice around teacher assumptions.

This objective will be met through a focused discussion of the qualitative study results. Participants will explore how these assumptions effect practice and how understanding and examining these assumptions can lead to improved practice.

4. Participants will experience a dialogue session.

This objective will be met through running a mock dialogue session with the group.

"BLIND REVIEW" PROPOSAL FORM

(Indicate no names and no institutions. Send five [5] copies of this form stapled to five [5] copies of a one-page typewritten summary of proposal.)

21st Annual POD Conference
October 17-20, 1996

SCALING THE HEIGHTS

1. Session title The Future Professoriate Project: Lessons Learned

2. Track (Select one only) ☒ Traditional
☐ Organizational Development
☐ Instructional Technology

3. Type of Session: Due to the large number of excellent proposals submitted each year and to the constraints of site logistics, it is sometimes impossible to accommodate your first choice of session type. If you want your proposal to be considered for another type of session, please indicate here: 1=1st choice; 2=2nd choice, etc. If you do NOT want your proposal considered for any but your first choice, indicate "1st" and leave the others boxes blank.

Preconference Workshop ☐ 3 hrs
or
☐ 6 hrs

Concurrent Session ☒ 60 min
or
☐ 90 min

Breakfast Roundtable Discussion ☐

Poster session ☐

If no other time is available, would you be willing to schedule your concurrent session DURING an educational/recreational excursion (anticipating potentially lower attendance)?

☒ Yes ☐ No

3. Abstract of no more than 50 words which will appear in the printed program if the proposal is accepted:

The objective for this session is to inform faculty and administrators about assessment procedures and results of a project which was initiated in 1991 and sponsored by the Fund for the improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE) and the Pew Charitable Trusts, and is designed to prepare graduate students for college and university faculty positions. During the session we will present our evaluation methods, an overview and discussion about our results, and will conclude with a broader discussion about assessment efforts and issues in this area.

4. **Describe briefly the methodology of the proposed session:**

The first half of the session we will present the overall assessment plan for the Future Professoriate Project and the lessons we have learned as a result of these efforts and experiences accrued while being involved in this project from its inception. We will discuss success stories and obstacles that we have encountered. Hand-outs about our project and our assessment efforts will be available to all session participants. Approximately one half of the session will be devoted to questions and discussion.

5. **Equipment needed:**

- ☐ none
- ☒ overhead transparency projector (and screen)
- ☒ 1/2" VHS player and monitor
- ☐ flipchart, pens, easel
- ☐ audio cassette recorder/player
- ☐ carousel slide projector and screen

**For "exotic" equipment and set-ups, contact the Program Chair:
jensene@byuh.edu BEFORE submitting your proposal.**

6. Type a **1-page summary** of your proposal detailing the objectives of the session you propose and how you intend to meet those objectives. (The summaries will undergo a "blind evaluation" process: hence, no identifying names or institutions should be in evidence.) Make five (5) copies of the summary and staple them to the five (5) copies of this form. Include one (1) copy of the cover sheet and send to the appropriate person listed below:

All proposals must be postmarked by Friday, March 8, 1996

Mail Concurrent, Roundtable &
Poster Session Proposals to:



Ed Jensen
Brigham Young University-Hawaii
124C JS Library, Box 1841
Laie HI 96762
Phone: 808-293-3853
Fax: 808-293-3877
E: jensene@byuh.edu

*Please note time
zone difference; this
is a Hawaii number!*

Mail Pre-Conference Workshop
Proposals to:



Arletta Knight
University of Oklahoma
Carnegie 115
Norman OK 73019
Phone: 405-325-3521
Fax: 405-325-7383
E: aknight@uoknor.edu

(Proposals must be mailed; phone, fax & email information is provided for inquiry purposes only.)

**Thank you for your interest in contributing to the tradition
of quality that is characteristic of POD Conferences.**

The Future Professoriate Project: Lessons Learned

The objective for this session is to inform faculty and administrators about assessment procedures and results of a project which is designed to prepare graduate students for future faculty positions. During the session we will present our evaluation methods, an overview and discussion about our results, and will conclude with a broader discussion about assessment efforts and issues in this area.

At our research-oriented university in the northeast we have recently completed another phase in the assessment of the Future Professoriate Project. A project which was initiated in 1991 and sponsored by the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE) and The Pew Charitable Trusts, and is designed to prepare graduate students for college and university faculty positions.

The Future Professoriate Project boasts three initiatives: (1) a series of Faculty Teaching Mentors seminars, designed to assist faculty in preparing graduate students for college teaching careers; (2) a higher level teaching appointment for graduate students, titled a teaching associateship; and (3) a Certificate in University Teaching program. Currently, over 20% of our faculty serve as faculty teaching mentors and there are over 150 teaching associates representing virtually all graduate programs on campus.

While under the auspices of our funding sources we conducted faculty and TA surveys and focus groups with project participants. Recently, we have followed up on these efforts by conducted interviews with over 35 TAs who have graduated from our institution and are now employed. The interviews focused on former TAs' experiences, perceptions of the Project, and suggestions for its improvement. The interviews were conducted by advanced doctoral students who were trained to assist with the project. These efforts mark the beginning of on-going assessment efforts for the project.

During the session we will present the overall assessment plan for the Future Professoriate Project--the lessons we have learned as a result of these efforts and experiences accrued while being involved in this project from its inception. We will discuss success stories and obstacles we have encountered. Hand-outs about our project and our assessment efforts will be available to all session participants. Approximately one half of the session will be devoted to questions and discussion.

"BLIND REVIEW" PROPOSAL FORM

(Indicate no names and no institutions. Send five [5] copies of this form stapled to five [5] copies of a one-page typewritten summary of proposal.)

21st Annual POD Conference
October 17-20, 1996

SCALING THE HEIGHTS

035
Only accepted if
med. medical ed.
topic - no doubt
this topic has
broad appeal

1. Session title Promoting Scholarly Activity in a Family Medicine Department

2. Track (Select one only) ☒ Traditional
☐ Organizational Development
☐ Instructional Technology

3. Type of Session: *Due to the large number of excellent proposals submitted each year and to the constraints of site logistics, it is sometimes impossible to accommodate your first choice of session type. If you want your proposal to be considered for another type of session, please indicate here: 1=1st choice; 2=2nd choice, etc. If you do NOT want your proposal considered for any but your first choice, indicate "1st" and leave the other boxes blank*

Preconference Workshop ☐ 3 hrs Concurrent Session 1st choice ☒ 60 min
or
☐ 6 hrs 2nd choice ☒ 90 min

Breakfast Roundtable Discussion ☐

Poster Session ☐

If no other time is available, would you be willing to schedule your concurrent session DURING an educational/recreational excursion (anticipating potentially lower attendance)?

☐ Yes ☒ No

3. Abstract or no more than 50 words which will appear in the printed program if the proposal is accepted:

This seminar presents a model developed for a multisite family medicine department to promote the scholarly activities of faculty. The goals of this project are to support scholarly activities and promote collaborative projects among the components of the department. Participants will explore project strategies for adaptation to their own institutions.

4. Describe briefly the methodology of the proposed session:

Presenters will use a combination of lecture and small group discussions for this session. The proposed agenda for the session is:

- a. Introductions
- b. Presentation of the project (lecture)
- c. Application of project strategies to participants' institutions (small group exercise)
- d. Conclusion

5. Equipment needed:

- ☐ none
- ☒ overhead transparency projector (and screen)
- ☐ 1/2" VHS player and monitor
- ☒ flipchart, pens, easel
- ☐ audio cassette recorder/player
- ☐ carousel slide projector and screen

***For "exotic" equipment and set-ups, contact the Program Chair:
jensene@byuh.edu BEFORE submitting your proposal***

6. Type a **1-page summary** of your proposal detailing the objectives of the session you propose and how you intend to meet those objectives. (The summaries will undergo a "blind evaluation" process; hence, no identifying names or institutions should be in evidence.) Make five (5) copies of the summary and staple them to the five (5) copies of this form. Include one (1) copy of the cover sheet and send to the appropriate person listed below:

All proposals must be postmarked by Friday, March 8, 1996

**Mail Concurrent, Roundtable &
Poster Session Proposals to:**

<p>Ed Jensen Brigham Young University-Hawaii 124C JS Library, Box 1841 Laie HI 96762 Phone: 808-293-3853 Fax: 808-293-3877 E:jensene@byuh.edu</p> <p>Please note time zone difference; this is a Hawaii number!</p>

**Mail Pre-Conference Workshop
Proposals to:**

<p>Arletta Knight University of Oklahoma Carnegie 115 Norman OK 73019 Phone: 405-325-3521 Fax: 405-325-7383 E: aknight@uoknor.edu</p>

(Proposals must be mailed; phone, fax & email information is provided for inquiry purposes only.)

**Thank you for your interest in contributing to the tradition of
quality that is characteristic of POD Conferences.**

Promoting Scholarly Activity in a Family Medicine Department

Rationale:

In the current health care context, clinical demands have increased the pressure on family medicine to maintain the quality of the discipline's educational and research endeavors. The long term quality of the clinical care provided by the specialty is dependent upon ongoing education and research. The responsibility for conducting education and research clearly rests with the academic departments of family medicine. These departments are currently challenged to assume increasing clinical and teaching responsibilities without, in many cases, substantially increased resources. The challenge faced by many departments is to develop strategies to meet clinical demands without sacrificing the quality of education and research in family.

After a period of rapid and expansive growth both geographically and in numbers of faculty, residents, and students, the Department of Family Practice and Community Medicine at the University of Texas-Houston addressed this challenge through the formation of the Departmental Alliance of Research and Education. This project provides an infrastructure to promote collaboration among faculty of a geographically and clinically diverse department. It is designed to help departmental faculty across thirteen clinical sites enhance their sense of belongingness within the department, their investment in the overall mission of the department, and their commitment to provide quality education and participate in research.

This seminar will provide an opportunity for participants to discuss the educational and research challenges of a multisite department within the context of a heavy clinical demand. In addition, participants will explore strategies to address similar challenges at their institutions. Finally, they will discuss the implications of the preliminary outcomes of the project as measures of the efficacy of this model for maintaining the academic integrity of a large department of family medicine.

Objectives:

Participants in this seminar will be able to:

- explain the structure of the project implemented in this department
- conduct a needs assessment for a similar project
- identify strategies for promoting excellence in education and research in a multisite department
- identify adaptations necessary to use strategies in their own departments

Content:

Brief history of departmental growth and evolution of project

Description of the project: (a) goals and objectives; (b) staff and administrative issues; (c) role of the Advisory Council; (d) needs assessment phase; (e) intervention strategies

Preliminary impact of the project: (a) presentations by faculty; (b) publications by faculty; (c) curricula developed; (d) evaluation systems implemented; (e) faculty satisfaction

Participant application of model (small group exercise)

"BLIND REVIEW" PROPOSAL FORM

(Indicate no names and no institutions. Send five [5] copies of this form stapled to five [5] copies of a one-page typewritten summary of proposal.)

21st Annual POD Conference
October 17-20, 1996

SCALING THE HEIGHTS

1. **Session title** Trigger Tapes for Teaching Development

2. **Track** (Select one only) ☐ Traditional
☐ Organizational Development
☒ Instructional Technology

3. **Type of Session:** *Due to the large number of excellent proposals submitted each year and to the constraints of site logistics, it is sometimes impossible to accommodate your first choice of session type. If you want your proposal to be considered for another type of session, please indicate here: 1=1st choice; 2=2nd choice, etc. If you do NOT want your proposal considered for any but your first choice, indicate "1st" and leave the others boxes blank.*

Preconference Workshop ☐ 3 hrs
or
☐ 6 hrs

Concurrent Session ☒ 60 min
or
☐ 90 min

Breakfast Roundtable Discussion ☐

Poster session ☐

If no other time is available, would you be willing to schedule your concurrent session DURING an educational/recreational excursion (anticipating potentially lower attendance)?

☐ Yes ☒ No

3. **Abstract** of no more than 50 words which will appear in the printed program if the proposal is accepted: This interactive workshop will explore the use of ten NEW (June 1996) video vignettes "Legends of the Fall Term" Previous tapes in this Critical Incidents series are now in use in more than 300 universities and colleges world-wide.

4. Describe briefly the methodology of the proposed session:

Participants will experience ways of using the tapes to promote dialogue about teaching improvement strategies. These methods include think-pair-share and a process based on Kolb's model of the experiential learning process.

5. Equipment needed:

☐ none

☒ overhead transparency projector (and screen)

☒ 1/2" VHS player and monitor

☒ flipchart, pens, easel

☐ audio cassette recorder/player

☐ carousel slide projector and screen

**For "exotic" equipment and set-ups, contact the Program Chair:
jensene@byuh.edu BEFORE submitting your proposal.**

6. Type a **1-page summary** of your proposal detailing the objectives of the session you propose and how you intend to meet those objectives. (The summaries will undergo a "blind evaluation" process; hence, no identifying names or institutions should be in evidence.) Make five (5) copies of the summary and staple them to the five (5) copies of this form. Include one (1) copy of the cover sheet and send to the appropriate person listed below:

All proposals must be postmarked by Friday, March 8, 1996

Mail Concurrent, Roundtable &
Poster Session Proposals to:



Ed Jensen
Brigham Young University-Hawaii
124C JS Library, Box 1841
Laie HI 96762
Phone: 808-293-3853
Fax: 808-293-3877
E: jensene@byuh.edu

*Please note time
zone difference; this
is a Hawaii number!*

Mail Pre-Conference Workshop
Proposals to:



Arletta Knight
University of Oklahoma
Carnegie 115
Norman OK 73019
Phone: 405-325-3521
Fax: 405-325-7383
E: aknight@uoknor.edu

(Proposals must be mailed; phone, fax & email information is provided for inquiry purposes only.)

**Thank you for your interest in contributing to the tradition
of quality that is characteristic of POD Conferences.**

IMPACT STATEMENT

Participants will know the teaching issues raised in each of ten different video vignettes and will feel confident and enthusiastic about the prospect of facilitating discussion of these vignettes for teaching improvement purposes

OBJECTIVES

Participants will...

1. Know the focus of each of ten different video vignettes (3-4 minutes each).
2. Understand the guidelines for two different processes for facilitating discussion and extracting teaching principles from the video scenarios.
3. Be able to facilitate discussion of the episodes based on their direct experience of the media and the method.
4. Enjoy sharing insights with their colleagues.

086
accept

"BLIND REVIEW" PROPOSAL FORM

(Indicate no names and no institutions. Send five [5] copies of this form stapled to five [5] copies of a one-page typewritten summary of proposal.)

21st Annual POD Conference

October 17-20, 1996

SCALING THE HEIGHTS

"Constructing Teaching Roles in the Context of Multiple Faculty Responsibilities: Implications for Faculty Development"

1. **Session title** _____

2. **Track** (Select one only) ☒ Traditional
☐ Organizational Development
☐ Instructional Technology

3. **Type of Session:** *Due to the large number of excellent proposals submitted each year and to the constraints of site logistics, it is sometimes impossible to accommodate your first choice of session type. If you want your proposal to be considered for another type of session, please indicate here: 1=1st choice; 2=2nd choice, etc. If you do NOT want your proposal considered for any but your first choice, indicate "1st" and leave the others boxes blank.*

Preconference Workshop ☐ 3 hrs
or
☐ 6 hrs

Concurrent Session ☒ 60 min
or
☐ 90 min

Breakfast Roundtable Discussion ☐

Poster session ☐

If no other time is available, would you be willing to schedule your concurrent session DURING an educational/recreational excursion (anticipating potentially lower attendance)?

☐ Yes ☒ No

3. **Abstract** of no more than 50 words which will appear in the printed program if the proposal is accepted:

This session presents qualitative research and invites discussion concerning how faculty members construct their teaching roles in relation to, and in the context of, their various other personal and professional roles (including researcher, institutional citizen, and service provider). Participants will discuss faculty development strategies that address the range of faculty roles and responsibilities.

4. **Describe briefly the methodology of the proposed session:**

This highly interactive session will involve four methodologies: a) presentation of research findings by three of the presenters; b) small group discussion among participants to explore implications and issues from the preceding presentation, followed by reporting back to the full group; c) a full group discussion; d) the collection of further ideas and questions from participants which will be summarized, along with small group discussion points, and mailed to all session participants following the conference.

5. **Equipment needed:**

- ☐ none
- ☒ overhead transparency projector (and screen)
- ☐ 1/2" VHS player and monitor
- ☒ flipchart, pens, easel
- ☐ audio cassette recorder/player
- ☐ carousel slide projector and screen

**For "exotic" equipment and set-ups, contact the Program Chair:
jensene@byuh.edu BEFORE submitting your proposal.**

6. Type a **1-page summary** of your proposal detailing the objectives of the session you propose and how you intend to meet those objectives. (The summaries will undergo a "blind evaluation" process; hence, no identifying names or institutions should be in evidence.) Make five (5) copies of the summary and staple them to the five (5) copies of this form. Include one (1) copy of the cover sheet and send to the appropriate person listed below:

All proposals must be postmarked by Friday, March 8, 1996

Mail Concurrent, Roundtable &
Poster Session Proposals to:



Ed Jensen
Brigham Young University-Hawaii
124C JS Library, Box 1841
Laie HI 96762
Phone: 808-293-3853
Fax: 808-293-3877
E: jensene@byuh.edu

*Please note time
zone difference: this
is a Hawaii number!*

Mail Pre-Conference Workshop
Proposals to:



Arletta Knight
University of Oklahoma
Carnegie 115
Norman OK 73019
Phone: 405-325-3521
Fax: 405-325-7383
E: aknight@uoknor.edu

(Proposals must be mailed; phone, fax & email information is provided for inquiry purposes only.)

**Thank you for your interest in contributing to the tradition
of quality that is characteristic of POD Conferences.**

Constructing Teaching Roles in the Context of Multiple Faculty Responsibilities: Implications for Faculty Development

Focus and Objectives: Across higher education today, there is considerable discussion about faculty members' multiple roles and responsibilities, including teaching, research, and public service. Often the discussion focuses on the challenges that faculty face in balancing and integrating these multiple roles. This interactive session will explore how university and community college faculty members construct the teaching role in relation to, and in the context of, their various other professional roles and responsibilities (such as researcher, institutional citizen, and service provider).

The objectives of the session are as follows: a) to present highlights and themes from a qualitative study concerning how faculty construct their teaching roles and how these roles relate to other professional and personal roles; b) to provide a forum for discussion about the design of faculty development opportunities that concern the full range of professional and institutional roles that faculty must fulfill; c) to encourage participants to generate together a set of further questions and issues concerning the multiple roles and responsibilities involved in faculty work and the implications for faculty development.

Format: The session will be organized around three questions, each of which will be addressed through a different "teaching methodology."

1) **Question 1:** What has been learned from the study about the multiple roles and responsibilities that faculty perceive they must fulfill, as well as the relationship of these diverse roles and responsibilities toward the ways in which faculty construct the teaching role? This question will be addressed through a panel presentation; the presenters will draw up examples and findings from the study they conducted (**35 minutes**).

2) **Question 2:** What are approaches to faculty development that recognize and address the full range of responsibilities that faculty members are expected to fulfill? To address this question, those attending the session will be invited to join small discussion groups led by the presenters. If possible, the groups will be formed to link those in similar sectors (research universities, community colleges, liberal arts colleges, and comprehensive universities). Each group will be invited to give a brief summary of the discussion (**25 minutes to discuss, 15 minutes to report**).

3) **Question 3:** What additional questions and issues should POD participants consider regarding the multiple roles that faculty members are expected to fulfill? Participants will reconvene into the full group to brainstorm responses to question three. (**15 minutes**).

Research Design: This session will draw on data collected in a larger project entitled "Constructing the Role of College Teacher: College Teachers Reflecting on College Teaching." The study involved 20 faculty members (half from a community college, half from a research university; some in humanities, some in social sciences; selected to reflect points across the career span). Data collection has consisted of three intensive interviews with each respondent, covering philosophies, beliefs, and theories concerning teaching, the teaching role in relation to other roles, and the developmental process of constructing the teaching role. Data analysis consisted of conducting a content analysis to identify themes, as well as uniquenesses, in individual cases.

068

"BLIND REVIEW" PROPOSAL FORM

(Indicate no names and no institutions. Send five [5] copies of this form stapled to five [5] copies of a one-page typewritten summary of proposal.)

21st Annual POD Conference
October 17-20, 1996

SCALING THE HEIGHTS

1. **Session title** Peer Review: Realizing Responsibility and Accomplishment

2. **Track** (Select one only) ☒ Traditional
☐ Organizational Development
☐ Instructional Technology

3. **Type of Session:** Due to the large number of excellent proposals submitted each year and to the constraints of site logistics, it is sometimes impossible to accommodate your first choice of session type. If you want your proposal to be considered for another type of session, please indicate here: 1=1st choice; 2=2nd choice, etc. If you do NOT want your proposal considered for any but your first choice, indicate "1st" and leave the others boxes blank.

Preconference Workshop ☐ 3 hrs
or
☐ 6 hrs

Concurrent Session ☒ 60 min
or
☐ 90 min

Breakfast Roundtable Discussion ☒

Poster session ☐

If no other time is available, would you be willing to schedule your concurrent session DURING an educational/recreational excursion (anticipating potentially lower attendance)?

☒ Yes ☐ No

3. **Abstract** of no more than 50 words which will appear in the printed program if the proposal is accepted:

The key to the writing center approach is dialogue and interaction. Therefore, our workshop, "Peer Review: Realizing Responsibility and Accomplishment," will be a combination of lecture, role modeling, and audience participation. It will illustrate how writing centers can boost learning campus-wide.

Peer Review: Realizing Responsibility and Accomplishment

A common phrase heard whispered in faculty rooms, hallways, and in darkened rooms which teachers pace at 2:00 p.m., is this: "I want to include more writing, but I just don't have time!" How often have you heard it . . . said it . . . thought it?

In this presentation, staff members of a Writing Center will introduce the Writing Center as a campus-wide resource that supports students and faculty in their writing-related classroom needs. This workshop will show how trained student writers/tutors can promote writing and literacy across all disciplines. Specifically, we will show how such resources can

- * Encourage faculty to use writing in their classes.
- * Demonstrate the importance of writing to learning.
- * Show how trained students can assist faculty with the writing component of their classes.
- * Model writing instruction that benefits faculty, students within classes, and student tutors.

The methods employed to accomplish these objectives will be lecture/presentation, role modeling, and interactive activities that involve both presenters and audience members. These methods will parallel the approach of all good Writing Centers--process and dialogue. The audience will be introduced to concepts proposed by Donald Murray, Kenneth Bruffee, Janet Emig, and other contemporary writing gurus.

In addition, student presenters will demonstrate tools they themselves have devised and skills they have acquired during hundreds of hours of tutorials. These student/tutors have first hand knowledge of one-on-one sessions, in-class presentations, and collaborative group experiences. They work with student accountants, social workers, mathematicians, English majors, athletes, thespians, and dancers--just to name a few. They also meet with ESL students, international students, and students with disabilities. It is impossible to write, edit, or in any way do the work for this diverse population; the responsibility must remain with the writer. And when this responsibility is insisted upon, when teacher, peer reviewer, and writer collaborate, learning accelerates and culminates in an incredible sense of accomplishment.

Our goal is to show that the obstacle of "time" can be surmounted. We want to encourage all who are uninitiated in the benefits of Writing Centers toward a heightened awareness and understanding. It can be done, and it can be fun in the process.

"BLIND REVIEW" PROPOSAL FORM

21st Annual POD Conference
October 17-20, 1996

Scaling the Heights

1. **Session title:** Building an Administrator's Paradigm for the Evaluation of the Teaching Portfolio

2. **Track:** Organizational Development

3. **Type of Session:**

1st choice: 60 min. concurrent session
2nd choice: 90 min. concurrent session

No, we would not be willing to schedule our session during an excursion time.

4. **Abstract:** Administrators' frequent questions about how to evaluate teaching portfolios demonstrate a need for guidelines. Faculty developers are in a position to develop a paradigm for more effective evaluation of the portfolio. This session will report on relevant research and anecdotal evidence, delineate possible approaches, and brainstorm strategies for effective evaluation.

5. **Methodology of session:** Mini-lecture that reprises where evaluation/assessment is currently and suggested methodology from others, small-group brainstorming on strategies and methodology for evaluation/assessment of the portfolio, followed by a group discussion summarizing suggestions that might begin the building of a paradigm.

6. **Equipment needed:**

Overhead projector and screen
Flipchart, pens, and easel

Building an Administrator's Paradigm for the Evaluation of the Teaching Portfolio

In the 1990s, focus on the evaluation of teaching effectiveness has moved from almost total faculty autonomy in the private classroom to the era of public accountability. Again and again deans and chairs have asked for ways to assess effective teaching. For this and other reasons, the teaching portfolio has become an increasingly popular approach for looking at individual faculty performance. Currently, no distinct, generally agreed-upon model for administrative evaluation of the portfolio has taken shape. However, it is a disservice to the teaching community to leave administrators without some common guidelines. Faculty developers are in a key position to contribute to the development of a paradigm that will enable administrators to evaluate the teaching portfolio more effectively.

The objectives of this session are to:

- Discuss relevant research literature in regard to the assessment of the teaching portfolio.
- Share stories that provide anecdotal evidence in this regard.
- Provide a forum for faculty developers to outline their own perspectives in regard to the assessment and evaluation of the teaching portfolio.
- Outline a methodology and benchmarks which would create a starting point for a paradigm for administrative evaluation of the teaching portfolio.

To accomplish the objectives of this session, we will present a short review of the most pertinent literature on the subject, followed by supporting anecdotal evidence. Participants will be asked to work in small groups to build the beginning methodology and outline of evaluation benchmarks. Finally, the entire group will generate a summary of the results of the small-groups' work.

PROPOSAL RECOMMENDATIONS SUMMARY FORM

Please make your recommendations and send this sheet to Ed Jensen, BYU Hawaii,
124C JS Library, Box 1841 Laie, HI 96762 **DEADLINE APRIL26!!**

CODE#

118

TITLE

*"Building an Administrator's Paradigm for the
Evaluation of the Teaching Portfolio."*

EVALUATION CRITERIA:

Please Evaluate the proposal on the criteria listed below:

<weak/strong>

- | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------|
| 1. Relevance to the POD conference audience | 1 2 3 4 <u>5</u> |
| 2. Likelihood of stimulating participant interaction | 1 2 3 <u>4</u> 5 |
| 3. Likelihood of offering/generating new data, ideas or insights | 1 2 3 <u>4</u> 5 |
| 4. Likelihood of providing usable information or skills | 1 2 3 4 <u>5</u> |
| 5. Likelihood of resulting in generalizable, transferable outcomes | 1 2 3 4 <u>5</u> |

RECOMMENDATIONS: (✓ one)

☒ **Accept**

☐ **Accept as a Different Session**

☐ **Accept with Changes**

(describe below)

☐ **Do Not Accept**

☐ **Accept with Reservations**

(describe below)

(circle one)
Concurrent 90 60 Roundtable Poster

COMMENTS: (Support your decision; be specific)

*This is a difficult problem. Sharing insights could be
very helpful - If it produces "guideposts" it would
be very useful.*

use back for further comments

PROPOSAL RECOMMENDATIONS SUMMARY FORM

Please make your recommendations and send this sheet to Ed Jensen, BYU Hawaii,
124C JS Library, Box 1841 Laie, HI 96762 **DEADLINE APRIL26!!**

CODE#

068

TITLE

Peer Review: Realizing Responsibility and Accomplishment

EVALUATION CRITERIA:

Please Evaluate the proposal on the criteria listed below:

<weak/strong>

- | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| 1. Relevance to the POD conference audience | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 2. Likelihood of stimulating participant interaction | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 3. Likelihood of offering/generating new data, ideas or insights | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 4. Likelihood of providing usable information or skills | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 5. Likelihood of resulting in generalizable, transferable outcomes | 1 2 3 4 5 |

RECOMMENDATIONS: (✓ one)

- ☒ **Accept as breakfast roundtable** . () **Accept as a Different Session**
(circle one)
Concurrent 90 60 Roundtable Poster
- () **Accept with Changes**
(describe below) () **Do Not Accept**
- () **Accept with Reservations**
(describe below)

COMMENTS: (Support your decision; be specific)

Only a limited number of participants will be in a position to implement processes of a writing center but it could provide useful ideas to "feed" to others-

use back for further comments

PROPOSAL RECOMMENDATIONS SUMMARY FORM

Please make your recommendations and send this sheet to Ed Jensen, BYU Hawaii,
124C JS Library, Box 1841 Laie, HI 96762 **DEADLINE APRIL26!!**

CODE#

086

TITLE

*"Constructing Teaching Roles in the Context of
Multiple Faculty Responses: Implications for F. D."*

EVALUATION CRITERIA:

Please Evaluate the proposal on the criteria listed below:

<weak/strong>

- | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------|
| 1. Relevance to the POD conference audience | 1 2 3 <u>4</u> 5 |
| 2. Likelihood of stimulating participant interaction | 1 2 3 <u>4</u> 5 |
| 3. Likelihood of offering/generating new data, ideas or insights | 1 2 3 <u>4</u> 5 |
| 4. Likelihood of providing usable information or skills | 1 2 3 <u>4</u> 5 |
| 5. Likelihood of resulting in generalizable, transferable outcomes | 1 2 3 <u>4</u> 5 |

RECOMMENDATIONS: (✓ one)

☒ **Accept**

☐ **Accept as a Different Session**

☐ **Accept with Changes**

(describe below)

☐ **Do Not Accept**

☐ **Accept with Reservations**

(describe below)

(circle one)
Concurrent 90 60 Roundtable Poster

COMMENTS: (Support your decision; be specific)

*Results of the research would be interesting.
Probably not too surprising. Could be useful.*

use back for further comments

PROPOSAL RECOMMENDATIONS SUMMARY FORM

Please make your recommendations and send this sheet to Ed Jensen, BYU Hawaii,
124C JS Library, Box 1841 Laie, HI 96762 **DEADLINE APRIL26!!**

CODE#

052

TITLE

Trigger Tapes for Teaching Development

EVALUATION CRITERIA:

Please Evaluate the proposal on the criteria listed below:

<weak/strong>

- | | | |
|----|-----------------------------------------------------------------|------------------|
| 1. | Relevance to the POD conference audience | 1 2 3 4 <u>5</u> |
| 2. | Likelihood of stimulating participant interaction | 1 2 3 <u>4</u> 5 |
| 3. | Likelihood of offering/generating new data, ideas or insights | 1 2 <u>3</u> 4 5 |
| 4. | Likelihood of providing usable information or skills | 1 2 3 <u>4</u> 5 |
| 5. | Likelihood of resulting in generalizable, transferable outcomes | 1 2 3 <u>4</u> 5 |

RECOMMENDATIONS: (✓ one)

☒ **Accept**

☐ **Accept as a Different Session**

(circle one)

Concurrent 90 60 Roundtable Poster

☐ **Accept with Changes**

(describe below)

☐ **Do Not Accept**

☐ **Accept with Reservations**

(describe below)

COMMENTS: (Support your decision; be specific)

I wonder how 10 Tapes can be reviewed + discussed in 60 mins.

use back for further comments

PROPOSAL RECOMMENDATIONS SUMMARY FORM

Please make your recommendations and send this sheet to Ed Jensen, BYU Hawaii,
124C JS Library, Box 1841 Laie, HI 96762 **DEADLINE APRIL 26!!**

CODE#

TITLE

Promoting Scholarly Activity in Family Dept

EVALUATION CRITERIA:

Please Evaluate the proposal on the criteria listed below:

<weak/strong>

- | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------|
| 1. Relevance to the POD conference audience | 1 2 <u>3</u> 4 5 |
| 2. Likelihood of stimulating participant interaction | 1 2 <u>3</u> 4 5 |
| 3. Likelihood of offering/generating new data, ideas or insights | 1 2 <u>3</u> 4 5 |
| 4. Likelihood of providing usable information or skills | 1 2 <u>3</u> 4 5 |
| 5. Likelihood of resulting in generalizable, transferable outcomes | 1 2 <u>3</u> 4 5 |

RECOMMENDATIONS: (✓ one)

☐ **Accept**

☐ **Accept as a Different Session**

(circle one)

Concurrent 90 60 Roundtable Poster

☐ **Accept with Changes**

(describe below)

☐ **Do Not Accept**

☒ **Accept with Reservations**

(describe below)

COMMENTS: (Support your decision; be specific)

Accept if med topic related to medical education. I doubt if this topic will have broad appeal.

use back for further comments

PROPOSAL RECOMMENDATIONS SUMMARY FORM

Please make your recommendations and send this sheet to Ed Jensen, BYU Hawaii,
124C JS Library, Box 1841 Laie, HI 96762 **DEADLINE APRIL26!!**

CODE#

019

TITLE

The Future Professional Project: Lessons Learned

EVALUATION CRITERIA:

Please Evaluate the proposal on the criteria listed below:

<weak/strong>

1.	Relevance to the POD conference audience	1 2 3 4 5
2.	Likelihood of stimulating participant interaction	1 2 3 4 5
3.	Likelihood of offering/generating new data, ideas or insights	1 2 3 4 5
4.	Likelihood of providing usable information or skills	1 2 3 4 5
5.	Likelihood of resulting in generalizable, transferable outcomes	1 2 3 4 5

RECOMMENDATIONS: (✓ one)

☒ **Accept**

☐ **Accept as a Different Session**

☐ **Accept with Changes**

(describe below)

☐ **Do Not Accept**

☐ **Accept with Reservations**

(describe below)

(circle one)
Concurrent 90 60 Roundtable Poster

COMMENTS: (Support your decision; be specific)

Presentation doesn't include much participant involvement, but information is important for those involved with graduate student development.

use back for further comments

PROPOSAL RECOMMENDATIONS SUMMARY FORM

Please make your recommendations and send this sheet to Ed Jensen, BYU Hawaii,
124C JS Library, Box 1841 Laie, HI 96762 **DEADLINE APRIL 26!!**

CODE#

003

TITLE

"Dialogue: Increasing Critical Reflection"

EVALUATION CRITERIA:

Please Evaluate the proposal on the criteria listed below:

<weak/strong>

- | | | |
|----|-----------------------------------------------------------------|------------------|
| 1. | Relevance to the POD conference audience | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 2. | Likelihood of stimulating participant interaction | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 3. | Likelihood of offering/generating new data, ideas or insights | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 4. | Likelihood of providing usable information or skills | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 5. | Likelihood of resulting in generalizable, transferable outcomes | 1 2 3 4 5 |

RECOMMENDATIONS: (✓ one)

☒ **Accept**

☐ **Accept as a Different Session**
(circle one)

Concurrent 90 60 Roundtable Poster

☐ **Accept with Changes**
(describe below)

☐ **Do Not Accept**

☐ **Accept with Reservations**
(describe below)

COMMENTS: (Support your decision; be specific)

Process of this session is the important dimension.

use back for further comments

PROPOSAL RECOMMENDATIONS SUMMARY FORM

Please make your recommendations and send this sheet to Ed Jensen, BYU Hawaii,
124C JS Library, Box 1841 Laie, HI 96762 **DEADLINE APRIL 26!!**

CODE#

110

TITLE

Meeting the Pro. Dev. Needs of Distance Educators

EVALUATION CRITERIA:

Please Evaluate the proposal on the criteria listed below:

<weak/strong>

- | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------|
| 1. Relevance to the POD conference audience | 1 2 3 <u>4</u> 5 |
| 2. Likelihood of stimulating participant interaction | 1 2 3 <u>4</u> 5 |
| 3. Likelihood of offering/generating new data, ideas or insights | 1 2 3 <u>4</u> 5 |
| 4. Likelihood of providing usable information or skills | 1 2 3 <u>4</u> 5 |
| 5. Likelihood of resulting in generalizable, transferable outcomes | 1 2 3 <u>4</u> 5 |

RECOMMENDATIONS: (✓ one)

☒ **Accept**

☒ **Accept as a Different Session**

(circle one)

Concurrent 90 60 Roundtable Poster

☐ **Accept with Changes**
(describe below)

☐ **Do Not Accept**

☐ **Accept with Reservations**
(describe below)

COMMENTS: (Support your decision; be specific)

Useful for those with distance ed. on their campuses.

use back for further comments

PROPOSAL RECOMMENDATIONS SUMMARY FORM

Please make your recommendations and send this sheet to Ed Jensen, BYU Hawaii,
124C JS Library, Box 1841 Laie, HI 96762 **DEADLINE APRIL26!!**

CODE#

102

TITLE

"Critically Reflecting on Our Problem Solving Strategies"

EVALUATION CRITERIA:

Please Evaluate the proposal on the criteria listed below:

<weak/strong>

- | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------|
| 1. Relevance to the POD conference audience | 1 2 3 4 <u>5</u> |
| 2. Likelihood of stimulating participant interaction | 1 2 3 4 <u>5</u> |
| 3. Likelihood of offering/generating new data, ideas or insights | 1 2 3 4 <u>5</u> |
| 4. Likelihood of providing usable information or skills | 1 2 3 4 <u>5</u> |
| 5. Likelihood of resulting in generalizable, transferable outcomes | 1 2 3 4 <u>5</u> |

RECOMMENDATIONS: (✓ one)

☒ **Accept**

☐ **Accept as a Different Session**

☐ **Accept with Changes**

(describe below)

☐ **Do Not Accept**

☐ **Accept with Reservations**

(describe below)

(circle one)
Concurrent 90 60 Roundtable Poster

COMMENTS: (Support your decision; be specific)

Encourages us to become reflective practitioners.

use back for further comments